

REMARKS

Claims 17-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 17 and 18 were amended in this response. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Support for the amendments may be found in the amended specification, pages 4-5.

Claims 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Galloway et al.* (US Patent 5,940,492). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Specifically, *Galloway* does not teach or disclose the feature “embedding at least one dynamic administrative function to the call control of the exchange at predetermined locations, wherein the dynamic administrative component becomes part of the call control during the operation of the exchange” and “altering, based on said at least one dynamic administrative function, at least one content value of the informational element contained in the at least one signaling message, wherein the step of altering the content value in turn alters an operational characteristic of the informational element related to the call control” as recited in claim 17 and similarly recited in claim 18.

As argued previously, the presently amended claims clearly recite a dynamic expandability of the call control (“wherein altering the content value in turn alters an operational characteristic of the informational element related to the call control”) of an exchange (VST) by using administrative functions (i.e., “manipulator functions”) which, with the assistance of an administration component, can be inserted at specific locations (points in call) of the APS. As recited in the claims, the administrative component becomes part of the connection control during the operation of an exchange. Accordingly, a generic information element (GIE) having an operational characteristic (i.e, function) is determined by the dynamic insertion of the administrative functions into the APS (see page 4, lines 13 to 18 of the present specification). On the basis of these features, it is possible that new services or performance features can be incorporated into an exchange of a communication network, by a network operator (administrator), without changing the APS.

In contrast, *Galloway* discloses SCCP messaging, where each SCCP-level message is encapsulated in the SIF field of an MSU as is illustrated in FIG. 3. The SCCP message is disclosed as comprising a message type field 45 and a number of parameters organized into three

parts 46, 47, 48 according to type. Mandatory parameters of fixed length are placed in the mandatory fixed part 46. Mandatory parameters of variable length are placed in the variable mandatory part 47. Optional parameters are placed in the optional part 48 (col. 3, lines 57-67).

Galloway further teaches that the SCCP messages include additional addressing information in the form of a global title, also referred to as a Called Party parameter. A global title as defined in *Galloway* identifies a destination globally within the telecommunications system. This parameter is included in Connection Request SCCP messages and all connectionless SCCP messages (col. 4, lines 1-20). The Called Party Number parameter 50 contains addressing information additional to that contained in the routing label 43. Parameter 50 comprises an address portion 53 including one or more address elements, and an address indicator portion 54 with information about the contents of the address portion 53. The address elements that may be included in the address portion 53 are a signaling point code 55 indicating the final destination signaling point of the message, a subsystem number 56 indicating the destination functional entity for the message at the destination signaling point, and a global title 57 generally in the form of a telephone number compliant with a particular numbering plan (col. 4, lines 22-53).

Accordingly, *Galloway* utilizes the above configuration to route SCCP messages in the signaling system when the code of the final destination is not known (col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 20). As such, *Galloway* does not rely on an administrative function in evaluating and altering the signaling message, but instead uses routing table 43 in conjunction with the global title as a predetermined basis to routing the messages. Also, *Galloway* is silent regarding a dynamic administrative component becoming part of the call control during the operation of the exchange – once the addresses are set, they cannot be considered “dynamic” nor do they participate in any sort of call control functions. Moreover, *Galloway* fails to teach a content value that is defined an operational characteristic of the informational element, as claimed in the present application “altering the content value in turn alters an operational characteristic of the informational element related to the call control”). The variable mandatory part 47 is simply a portion of the SCCP informational field that determines routing of a message – the operational characteristic is not affected at all by the values present in this field..

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 17-18 are allowable and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-241) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

Customer No.: 29177

Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: March 29, 2006\